

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN, L.L.P.

T. SCOTT THOMPSON
WRITER'S E-MAIL
STHOMPSON@CRBLAW.COM

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-3458
TELEPHONE (202) 659-9750
FAX (202) 452-0067
WWW.CRBLAW.COM

LOS ANGELES OFFICE
2381 ROSECRANS AVENUE, SUITE 110
EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA 90245-4290
TELEPHONE (310) 643-7999
FAX (310) 643-7997

November 22, 2002

VIA COURIER

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte Presentations In CS Docket No. 95-184 and MM Docket No. 92-260

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The following is notice pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, that on November 21, 2002, on behalf of Charter Communications, T. Scott Thompson of Cole, Raywid & Braverman, LLP, and Marvin Rappaport of Charter Communications met with Bill Johnson, Deputy Bureau Chief, John Norton, Deputy Chief Policy Division, and Mary Beth Murphy, Chief Policy Division, all of the Media Bureau, to discuss issues pending as a result of petitions for reconsideration and the Commission's Further Notice in the above referenced dockets.

During the meetings, Charter's representatives generally restated the positions set forth in Charter's comments in the Dockets and responded to questions. Specifically, they reiterated Charter's belief that the Commission should not adopt any limitation on exclusive agreements between residential MDU owners and operators, that the Commission should not adopt regulations permitting MDU owners a "fresh look" to renegotiate perpetual exclusive agreements, and that the Commission, in order to avoid constitutional takings issues and distortion of the marketplace must continue to permit cable operators the option of removing their home run wires and facilities in the event of termination by an MDU owner. Charter's representatives also expressed Charter's belief that competition in the residential MDU context has been robust since the adoption of the Commission's rules in 1997, and that competition continues to grow. Finally, they expressed Charter's belief that the Commission exceeded its statutory authority in the current rules, and reminded the Commission that an appeal of the

Marlene H. Dortch
November 22, 2002
Page 2

Commission's rules has been pending in the Eighth Circuit while the Commission addresses the issues on reconsideration and in the Further Notice.

If there are any questions regarding the above-described meetings, please contact the undersigned counsel for Charter.

Sincerely,

T. Scott Thompson